UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/599,947	02/26/2007	Mikko Nevalainen	P2853US00	7062

30671   7590   01/27/2010
DITTHAVONG MORI & STEINER, P.C.
918 Prince Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

EXAMINER
GEORGEWILL, OPIRIBO

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2617	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/27/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docket@dcpatent.com

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *03 November 2009*.
2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-42* is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) *1-42* is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *13 October 2006* is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is responsive to Applicant's amendment filed on 11/03/09.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 27, 32, 37, and 39 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Drawings

3. The drawings are objected to because the unlabeled rectangle box(es) Fig 4A, 4B and 5, boxes 92, 82, 86, 88, 84' in Fig 4A, 92, 94, 82, 86, 88 84' in Fig 4B, 108, 106, 104, 102 and 110 in Fig 5, should be provided with descriptive text labels. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must

be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet"

pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner,

the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the

next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

4. The specification is objected to as failing to provide antecedent basis for the

claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP 608.01(o).

5. The specification needs to define "the computer readable medium" of claims 30,

31, 41, 42 such as a ROM, hard drive optical disk, and other forms of physical

computer memory and exclude transitory computer readable medium.

6. Examiner notes that "A transitory, propagating signal ... is not a "process,

machine, manufacture, or composition of matter." Those four categories define

the explicit scope and reach of subject matter patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 101;

thus, such a signal cannot be patentable subject matter." (*In re Petrus A.C.M.*

Nuijten; Fed Cir, 2006-1371, 9/20/2007).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in **Graham v. John Deere Co., 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966)**, that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows: *(See MPEP Ch. 2141)*

    a. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art;
    b. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims in issue;
    c. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art; and
    d. Evaluating evidence of secondary considerations for indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

8. **Claims 1-17, 21, 23 and 25-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raiz et al. US Pub No. 20020164025 A1 in view of Kolakowski, Victoria, S., WIPO Pub No. 02/49732 A1 and further in view of Applicant Admitted Prior Art (Henceforth "AAPA").**

Re claim **1**, Raiz discloses a method comprising:

detecting, at a terminal, a user input directed to start the execution of an application on said terminal device (paragraph [51], ... every time the user starts the application while in the grace period),

initiating a message to a surveillance center, wherein said message indicates the execution of an application (paragraph [51], ... every time the user starts the application while in the grace period the application with attempt to connect to the license server (surveillance center) and request renewed authorization key (message)), and

starting a restricted execution of said application, within predetermined limits, after said message has been initiated (paragraph [51], if the grace period ends

(starting a restricted execution, within predetermined limits) with no issuance of the replacement license key).

Raiz discloses the claimed invention but is silent on the mobility of the terminal. Kolakowski in analogous art discloses a method for surveyed executing (page 3, lines 22 – 28, software encryption key to authorize the wireless remote entertainment system to operate for a predetermined time or amount of usage; page 9, line 27 – 30, functionality using upstream channel ... may be changed ... purchase a key) of an application (page 9, line 27, Fully interactive functionality) on a mobile terminal device (fig 1, page 5, line 4 wireless broadcast; page 5, line 30, upstream communication channel may utilize a variety of conventional transmission technologies, including wireless or cellular) so as to create a mobile multi—player computer game device that was mobile, would use redundant downstream transmission and would not be dependent upon internet congestion (page 2, lines 31 - 33). Kolakowski further discloses a mobile terminal device (fig 1, page 5, line 4 wireless broadcast; page 5, line 30, upstream communication channel may utilize a variety of conventional transmission technologies, including wireless or cellular). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skills in the art, at the time the invention was made, to incorporate the teaching of Kolakowski to have a mobile terminal device in the method disclosed by Raiz so as to create a mobile multi-player computer game device that to have a mobile terminal device that was mobile, would use redundant downstream transmission and would not be dependent upon internet congestion.

Raiz in view of Kolakowski discloses the claimed invention including connecting to the connecting to the surveillance center and sending a message indicating that the application has been started (paragraph [51], where Raiz discloses connect to the license server and request a renewed key (message) every time the user starts the application (message indicates that the application has started)).

Raiz in view of Kolakowski is silent on wherein the message is initiated after a predetermined period of time has passed since the application was first started or after a predetermined number of input actions has been input to the application. AAPA in analogous discloses mobile gaming and distribution and use of application and games on mobile devices (see paragraph [6]). AAPA discloses the known technique of connecting to a surveillance center after a predetermined time has passed or after a predetermined number of input actions has been input to the application so as to expose a user to the application (paragraph [10], where AAPA discloses that after a predetermined time (predetermined period of the time has passed since the application was first started) or after a number of application starts (predetermined number of inputs actions has been input to the application), the software sets up an online connection to the manufacturer (surveillance center)) . It would therefore have been obvious to a person having ordinary skills in the art, at the time the invention was made to, incorporate the known technique of connecting to the surveillance center after a predetermined time has passed or after a number of predetermined number of input actions has

been input to the application into the message sending to the surveillance center

disclosed by Raiz in view of Kolakowski with predictable results of sending the

message to the surveillance center that indicates that the application has been

started and the message is initiated after a predetermined period of time has

passed since the application was first started or after a predetermined number of

input actions has been input to the application and an improvement of the system

of exposing the user to the application (paragraph [10], put at the customers

disposal for a certain test period without charge).

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein. Claims 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9,

11, 15, 16, 17, 23, 25, 26 depend on claim 1 and only further limitations will be

addressed below.

Re claim **2**, the combined teaching of Raiz in view of Kolakowski and

further in view of AAPA, as a whole, discloses

sending said message to said surveillance center (Raiz: paragraph [51], every

time the user starts, the application while in the grace period the application will

attempt to connect the license server and request a renewed authorization key

(sending message))

starting said restricted execution of the said application, with predetermined

limits, after said message has been sent (Raiz: paragraph [51], if the grace

period ends (starting a restricted execution, within predetermined limits) with no

issuance of the replacement license key).

Re claim **3**, the combined teaching of Raiz in view of Kolakowski and further in view of AAPA, as a whole, discloses that the application is a game (Kolakowski: page 4, line 15, operation of game)

Re claim **4**, the combined teaching of Raiz in view of Kolakowski and further in view of AAPA, as a whole, disclose that the message indicates the start of execution of an application (Raiz, paragraph [51], every time the user starts the application while in the grace period, the application will attempt to connect to the license server and request a renewed authorization key)

Re claim **5**, the combined teaching of Raiz in view of Kolakowski and further in view of AAPA, as a whole, discloses said limit comprise a time limit (Raiz: paragraph [51], running the application until the end of the grace period).

Re claim **6**, the combined teaching of Raiz in view of Kolakowski and further in view of AAPA, as a whole, discloses said limit comprise an application limit (Kolakowski: page 3, line 27 activates an otherwise locked system to operate permanently; page 9, line 10, demo mode).

Re claim **7**, the combined teaching of Raiz in view of Kolakowski and further in view of AAPA, as a whole, discloses

setting up a connection to a surveillance center (implicit from Raiz, paragraph [51], connecting to the license server)

sending a message to a surveillance center, said message comprise application execution related data (Raiz, paragraph [51], connect to the license server and

request a renewed authorization key; paragraph [35], fingerprint of computer (execution related data))

receiving an authorization to execute said application within said limits defined by said surveillance center (Raiz: paragraph [51], implicit from requesting a renewed authorization key; paragraph [42], key is encrypted to work on only the user's fingerprinted computer and only for a specific period of time).

The rejection of claim 7 is incorporated herein. Claims 8 and 10 depend on claim 7 and only further limitations will be addressed below.

Re claim **8**, the combined teaching of Raiz in view of Kolakowski and further in view of AAPA, as a whole, discloses said application execution related data (paragraph [35], where Raiz discloses that the computer fingerprint can be digital information stored on a microprocessor …. A person having ordinary skill in the art will recognize from the reference of fingerprint that the information has to be unique to the terminal). The combined teaching of Raiz in view of Kolakowski, as a whole, is silent on the further comprising of the execution related data. However, it would be obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to use a mobile terminal fingerprint like the International Mobile Equipment Identity (mobile electronic terminal identification) as a unique number because it is obvious to try.

Re claim **9**, the combined teaching of Raiz in view of Kolakowski and further in view of AAPA, as a whole, discloses the application starts the sending of a message to said surveillance center (Raiz: paragraph [51], every time the

user starts the application ... to connect to the license server and request a renewed authorization key).

Re claim **10**, the combined teaching of Raiz in view of Kolakowski and further in view of AAPA, as a whole, discloses

outputting a user-authorization request to send a message to a surveillance center (Raiz: paragraph [51], the user is alerted to call in or complete the registration wizard to restart account)

detecting a user-authorization input authorizing said connection setup (implicit from step above).

Re claim **11**, the combined teaching of Raiz in view of Kolakowski and further in view of AAPA, as a whole, discloses

outputting a user-authorization request to perform a payment transaction (Raiz: paragraph [44], each time a new user subscribes to use the application ... payment information is directed to the financial system)

detecting a user-authorization input for authorizing said payment transaction (implicit from the step above)

The rejection of claim 11 is incorporated herein. Claim 12, 13, 14 depend on claim 11 and only further limitations will be addressed below.

Re claim **12**, the combined teaching of Raiz in view of Kolakowski and further in view of AAPA, as a whole, discloses whereby the authorized payment transaction is performed by charging an onboard payment device (Raiz: paragraph [27], financial and commercial functions, paragraph [44])

Re claim **13**, the combined teaching of Raiz in view of Kolakowski and further in view of AAPA, as a whole, discloses wherein said authorization payment transaction is performed by sending said authorization for said payment transaction to said surveillance center (Raiz: paragraph [44], payment fulfillment information is then posted back to the license server)

Re claim **14**, the combined the combined teaching of Raiz in view of Kolakowski and further in view of AAPA, as a whole, discloses wherein the payment transaction is charged to the next telephone bill (AAPA: paragraph [6])

Re claim **15**, the combined teaching of Raiz in view of Kolakowski and further in view of AAPA, as a whole, discloses that the message is sent periodically (Kolakowski: page 9, lines 26 - 27, Fully interactive functionality using upstream communications channel 32 may be charged on a metered basis (by minute or data throughput), implicit that the message has to be sent often (periodically)).

Re claim **16**, the combined teaching of Raiz in view of Kolakowski and further in view of AAPA, as a whole, discloses said application determines the number of messages to be sent and the point in time a message is sent (Raiz: paragraph [48], if the license key has expired, the application connects to the license server without prompting a user)

Re claim **17**, the combined teaching of Raiz in view of Kolakowski and further in view of AAPA, as a whole, discloses the determining that the message cannot has not be sent (Raiz: paragraph [51], if connection cannot be made;

implicit that a determination has been made that the message has not been sent).

The rejection of claim 17 is incorporated herein. Claim 21 depends on claim 17 and only further limitations will be addressed below.

Re claim **21**, the combined teaching of Raiz in view of Kolakowski and further in view of AAPA, as a whole, disclose the starting/continuing a restricted execution of said application, within defined limits, if the message has not been sent (Raiz: paragraph [34], the system is returned to demonstration mode (restricted execution) ... when the 30 days end (defined limits); paragraph [51], connection cannot be made; note that the message not being sent will allow a subscription lapse and continuing on demonstration mode).

Re claim **23**, the combined teaching of Raiz in view of Kolakowski and further in view of AAPA, as a whole, discloses the determination that the message has not been sent (Raiz: paragraph [51], connection cannot be made (implicit that message has not been sent))

interrupt the execution of said application, if message has not been sent (Raiz: paragraph [51], at the end of grace period, the user is alerted to complete the registration wizard information to restart (implicit interrupted) the account))

Re claim **25**, the combined teaching of Raiz in view of Kolakowski and further in view of AAPA, as a whole, discloses the downloading application software to said mobile terminal device (paragraph [27], A user can obtain the demonstration version of software by downloading from an FTP site).

Re claim **26**, the combined teaching of Raiz in view of Kolakowski and

further in view of AAPA, as a whole, discloses

determining the actual date (implicit from 3rd limitation)

comparing said actual date with time rule provided in said application (implicit

from 3rd limitation),

interrupting the execution of said application, if said actual date does not meet

said time rule (Raiz: paragraph [51], at the end of grace period, the user is

alerted to complete the registration wizard information to restart (implicit

interrupted) the account)).

Re claim **27**, the claim is the receiving side of the method of claim 7 and

would need the method of claim 7 to be carried out for it to actualize. It is

therefore rejected for the same reason as above.

The rejection of claim 27 is incorporated herein. Claim 28 depends on

claim 7 and only further limitations will be addressed below.

Re claim **28**, the claim is the receiving side of claim of the method of claim

7 and would need the method of claim 7 to be carried out for it to actualize. It is

therefore rejected for the same reasons as above.

Re claim **29**, contains similar limitations as claim 1, and is rejected for the

same reasons as above.

Re claim **30**, it is drawn to a computer readable medium embodying a

program for executing claim 1 and is rejected for the same reasons used above.

Examiner notes that the computer readable medium has not been defined in the

specifications and for examining propose would be construed to be of a statutory class (see Kolakowski, page 4, line 26, a processor based system).

Re claim **31**, it is drawn to a computer readable medium embodying a program for executing claim 1 and is rejected for the same reasons used above. Examiner notes that the computer readable medium has not been defined in the specifications and for examining propose would be construed to be of a statutory class (see Kolakowski, page 4, line 26, processor based system).

Re claim **32**, it is drawn to the apparatus by the corresponding method claim 1 and is rejected for the same reasons as above.

Re claim **33**, and applied to claim 32 above, it is drawn to the apparatus by the corresponding method claim 7 and is rejected for the same reasons as above.

Re claim **34**, and applied to claim 32 above, it is drawn to the apparatus by the corresponding method claim 3 and is rejected for the same reasons as above.

Re claim **35**, and applied to claim 32 above, it is drawn to the apparatus by the corresponding method claim 1 and is rejected for the same reasons as above. Furthermore, Kolakowski discloses cellular telephone transmitter (page 7, 24, it would be obvious to a person having ordinary skills in the art that the try to use a mobile telephone).

Re claim **36**, and applied to claim 32 above, it is drawn to the apparatus by the corresponding method claim 19 and is rejected for the same reason as above.

Re claim **37**, it is drawn to the apparatus by the corresponding method claim 1 and is rejected for the same reasons as above.

Re claim **38**, and applied to claim 37 above, it is drawn to the apparatus by the corresponding method claim 7 and is rejected for the same reason as above.

Re claim **39**, it is drawn to the system by the corresponding method claim 1 and is rejected for the same reasons as above.

Re claim **40**, contains similar limitations as claim 27, and is rejected for the same reasons as above.

Re claim **41**, it is drawn to a computer readable medium embodying a program for executing claim 27 and is rejected for the same reasons used above. Examiner notes that the computer readable medium has not been defined in the specifications and for examining propose would be construed to be of a statutory class.

Re claim **42**, it is drawn to a computer readable medium embodying a program for executing claim 27 and is rejected for the same reasons used above. Examiner notes that the computer readable medium has not been defined in the specifications and for examining propose would be construed to be of a statutory class.

9. **Claims 18, 19, 22 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raiz et al. US Pub No. 20020164025 A1 in view of Kolakowski, Victoria, S., WIPO Pub No. 02/49732 A1 further in view of Applicant Admitted Prior Art (Henceforth "AAPA") as applied in claim 1, and Meyer, Michael., "TCP Performance over GPRS", In proc Wireless Communication and Networking Conference, 1999, WCNC, 1999 IEEE, vol 3.**

The rejection of claim 17 is incorporated herein. Claims 18, 19 depend on claim 17 and only further limitations will be addressed below.

Re claim **18**, the combined teaching of Raiz in view of Kolakowski and further in view of AAPA discloses the claim invention but is silent on the details of the message not being sent. However, Meyer in analogous art discloses a packet oriented data service (message) for a mobile terminal device (see abstract) so as to use TCP on a cellular data network (page 1248, col 2, lines 24 – 25). Meyer further discloses that the determination that the message is not being sent, if a confirmation message that said message has been sent is not received with a defined time (page 1249, col 2, section III, paragraph [2], Meyer disclose a TCP timeout (confirmation message not received during defined time), and that timeouts should only occur if segments (messages) are lost.). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teaching of Meyer into the disclosure of Raiz in view of

Kolakowski and further in view of AAPA, as a whole, to determine the message has not been sent if an confirmation message that the message has been sent is not received within a defined period so as to use TCP in a cellular data network.

Re claim **19**, the combined teaching Raiz in view of Kolakowski and further in view of AAPA and Meyer, as a whole, is silent on the buffering of said message not sent. However, examiner takes official notice that the buffering of message not sent in the TCP environment disclosed by Raiz in view of Kolakowski and further in view of Meyer known and expected.

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein. Claim 22 depends on claim 1 and only further limitations of will be addressed below.

Re claim **22**, the combined teaching of Raiz in view of Kolakowski and further in view of AAPA and Meyer, as a whole, discloses the receiving of a confirmation message that said message has been sent (Meyer: page 1251, col 2, first paragraph, TCP updates it RTO value based on its received acknowledgements).

Re claim **24**, the combined teaching of Raiz in view of Kolakowski and further in view of AAPA and Meyer discloses that the message is sent via general packet radio service (Meyer: page 1249, col 2, section IV, paragraph [2]).

10. **Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raiz et al. US Pub No. 20020164025 A1 in view of Kolakowski, Victoria, S., WIPO Pub No. 02/49732 A1 and further in view of Applicant Admitted Prior Art**

(Henceforth "AAPA") as applied in claim 1, and Soliman, Samir S., US Pat No. 6785249 B2.

The rejection of claim 17 is incorporated herein. Claim 20 depends on claim 17 and only further limitations of will be addressed below.

Re claim **20**, the combined teaching of Raiz in view of Kolakowski and further in view of AAPA, as a whole, disclose the starting/continuing a restricted execution of said application, within defined limits, if the message has not been sent (paragraph [34], the system is returned to demonstration mode (restricted execution) … when the 30 days end (defined limits); paragraph [51], connection cannot be made; note that the message not being sent will allow a subscription lapse and continuing on demonstration mode). Raiz in view of Kolakowski and further in view of AAPA is silent on determining the condition that prevents the sending of said message. Soliman in analogous art discloses a wireless terminal device and a method of determining that a link has failed (see abstract) so as to determine the reason a call was dropped and if so take appropriate action (col 6, lines 6 - 9). Soliman further discloses that a method determines whether a failure has occurred in the link (col 6, lines 41 - 42) and the potential cause of the failure (col 7 lines 1 - 2). It would be obvious to a person having ordinary skills in the art, at the time the invention was made, to incorporate the teaching of Soliman into the disclosure of Raiz in view of Kolakowski and further in view of AAPA, as a whole, to have the terminal determine conditions that prevent the sending of the message so as to have the capability of taking appropriate action.

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein. Claim 24 depends on claim 1 and only further limitations will be addressed below.

Conclusion

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to OPIRIBO GEORGEWILL whose telephone

number is (571)270-7926. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday, 9:00am - 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, LunYi Lao can be reached on (571)272-7671. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/OPIRIBO GEORGEWILL/
Examiner, Art Unit 2617

/LUN-YI LAO/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617